

Appln No. 10/760,258
Amdt. Dated February 9, 2006
Response to Office Action of November 25, 2005

9

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated November 25, 2005. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions and amendments.

Amendments

The description has been amended throughout to address typographical errors and obvious mistakes that have come to light upon review of the specification.

Claim 5 has been amended to address the omission identified by the Examiner.

Independent Claims 1 and 5 have been amended to further define the features that distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Basis for the amendments can be found in the section of the Detailed Description entitled 'Controller Board'.

Accordingly, the amendments do not add any new matter.

35 U.S.C. §102 - Claims 1, 3 to 5 and 7

Claims 1, 3 to 5 and 7 stand rejected for lack of novelty in light of US 6,158,850 to Cook.

Independent Claims 1 and 5 have been amended to further define the features that distinguish the present invention from that shown in Cook. The QA integrated circuits in the inkjet cartridge and the ink refill not only allow the printer controller to authenticate the cartridge and refill, but also provide the controller with their operational characteristics. In particular, the printheads on the cartridge can print at different speeds depending on the standard of cartridge purchased. The controller needs to verify that the refill is authentic and therefore delivering suitable, and that the cartridge is also a compatible cartridge with known operating characteristics so that the media feed speed can be correspondingly set.

In contrast, Cook teaches an inkjet printer that checks whether a secondary ink supply 12 and the cartridge 10 are compatible before opening the fluid connection between the two.

Appln No. 10/760,258
Amdt. Dated February 9, 2006
Response to Office Action of November 25, 2005

10

Cook does not contemplate a range of cartridges with differing performance characteristics. It simply provides a safeguard against contamination of a cartridge with incorrect refill ink.

In light of the above, the cited reference fails to anticipate the present invention defined by amended claims 1 or 5.

35 U.S.C. §103 - Claims 2 and 6

Claim 2 stands rejected as obvious in light of Cook in view of US 6,293,649 to Norton. Claim 6 also stands rejected as obvious in light of Cook in view of US 2003/0007023 to Barclay.

As discussed above, Cook fails to disclose a printer that uses a range of cartridges with differing print speeds. Norton also fails to teach cartridges with different performance characteristics. Similarly, Barclay does not described such an arrangement.

As Claims 2 and 6 and appended to amended Claims 1 and 5 respectively, the cited references fail to disclose all the elements of these claims. Accordingly, Claims 2 and 6 are not obvious in light of Cook and Norton or Cook and Barclay.

Appn No. 10/760,258
Amdt. Dated February 9, 2006
Response to Office Action of November 25, 2005

11

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762